UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/466,279	12/17/1999	HAJIME INOUE	SONYJP-3.0-0	9975

530 7590 02/09/2007

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,
KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK
600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER	
BROWN, RUEBEN M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2623	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/09/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/466,279	INOUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Reuben M. Brown	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 November 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11 and 13-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,3-11 and 13-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 11/6/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Examiner repeats and maintains the previous 112 rejection. First of all, examiner is in agreement with applicant's definition of the terms. In the response of 11/6/2006, on page 8 applicant notes that the term Node Unique ID refers to the identifier set by the vendor or manufacturer, and is consistent with its usage in both Fujimora & Staats. On pages 7-8, applicant appears to define the term Unique Node ID to refer to one of the 0 to 63 bus addresses in the IEEE 1394 standard, examine concurs.

As pointed out in the 112 rejection, Fig. 8a, step S5, appears to check the Node Unique ID of the connected device to see if it is registered, step S6. Then in step S9, if the Node Unique ID of the device is registered, then the system allocates the registered equipment name. However, claim 1 recites, 'allocate the unique node identification number,..., said register storing a record of said unique node identification number allocated to said selected device'.

Therefore, there appears to be at least two questions. Which action takes place first, the registering of the equipment, as shown in Fig. 8A and discussed on pages 17-18; or the allocating of the unique node identification number and then its registering and storing, as recited in the claims. The second question is, what value does step S6 of Fig. 8A refer to, the Node Unique ID

or the unique node identification number. These questions are relevant, especially in light of the acknowledged differences between the terms Node Unique ID and Unique Node ID (which the claimed unique node identification number appears to be a version of). Examiner does note that page 13, lines 12-27and page 14, appears to discuss the registering of IEEE 1394 numbers.

Moreover, it is pointed out that the term 'unique node identification number', presently recited in the amended claims, is not found in that form anywhere in the original specification, claims or drawings. Thus its recitation in the presently amended claims appears to be a composite of the at least two different terms used in the specification and drawings.

With respect to the prior art rejection, applicant's main argument as found on pages 10-11, is that the node reference IDs serve as pointers to the data records...and that that operation, however, it is distinguishable from the claimed invention. Applicant argues that the node base address of Staats corresponds with the claimed unique node identification number. And that since in Staats the node base address is changed after a bus reset, the claimed invention is not met.

As pointed out above, applicant's claimed unique node identification number is a term not found at any point in the specification, drawings or original claims. Therefore the term is entitled to its broadest possible interpretation. Thus any teaching by a reference that allocates a unique node identification number to a selected device and maintains that number after a bus reset will meet the claim. In particular, as argued by the applicant on page 10, Staats teaches

creating data records that are associated with a corresponding node unique ID (i.e., a particular device). Examiner asserts that since the node reference IDs are pointers to data records associated with corresponding devices, that the node reference ID is an allocated unique node identification number, registered and stored in a record (and thus meets the claimed unique node identification number).

Furthermore, since the node reference ID are maintained during a bust reset, the claimed feature of a unique node identification number allocated to a device and maintained after a bus reset, emphasis added, is still met by the disclosure of Staats.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1 & 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Considering claims 1 & 11, applicant recites, 'and for allocating unique node identification numbers to said selected devices, for each of said selected devices, said register storing a record of said unique node identification number allocated to said selected device and maintaining said record regardless of whether said selected device remains connected to said digital interface'. On page 17, lines 12-15 of the specification, it is disclosed, "in step S3, the unique ID numbers of the nodes of the equipment connected to the bus are discriminated (step S5)", which corresponds with Fig. 8A. However, the specification on page 17, lines 16-20 goes on to specifically disclose that "whether there is equipment having ***the ID number*** among the registered equipment or not is discriminated (step S6)", emphasis added. In other words the specification does not explicitly state that this "ID number" is synonymous with the "Node Unique ID" as shown in step S5 in Fig. 8A and thus corresponds with the claimed "node identification number", and furthermore, in particular applicant uses various terms that are not necessarily interchangeable based on the specific definitions.

It is pointed out that while the term, "Node Unique ID" is used in the Fig. 8A of the drawings, this term was not at all found in the specification. This point is of particular importance, since in the art of bus technology, the terms "Node Unique ID" and "Unique Node ID" are both generally, but are not necessarily interchangeable or synonymous. This difference was noted by applicant in response filed 11/25. In particular, generally the "Node Unique ID" refers to the identification number that includes the vendor code and a chip series code.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1, 3-8, 10-11, 13-18 & 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshino, (EP # 0 853 402 A), in view of Staats, (U.S. Pat # 5,764,930).

Considering amended claim 1, the claimed receiving apparatus for receiving a digital broadcast which comprises a transport stream, such that the video and audio data have been compressed and multiplexed, comprising:

' a decoder for decoding the transport stream' is met by the operation of the IRD 102, which receives video signals, and that includes video processing section 303, Yoshino, col. 4, lines 17-35.

'digital interface for mutually transmitting the decoded transport stream to and from digital signal processing devices' reads on the digital connection interface 304; col. 4, lines 21-25.

'register for selecting predetermined number of devices from among a plurality of DSP devices connected to the digital interface for allocating node ID numbers to the selected devices, such that the register stores a record of the node ID number allocated to the selected device' reads on col. 4, lines 38-47 & col. 5, lines 5-21.

As for the amended claimed feature of the 'register maintaining the record of the unique node identification number regardless of whether the selected device remains connected to the digital interface', Yoshino operates according the standard IEEE 1394 Protocol, wherein upon a bus reset, the node IDs of all of the nodes may be changed. It is noted that a bus reset may be caused by the addition or removal of a device to/from the instant bus and that during a bus reset, all devices are disconnected from the bus, and all or only some of the original devices are re-connected to the bus, along with possibly new device(s). However, Staats which is in the same field of endeavor seeks to overcome the limitations of the IEEE 1394 Protocol, by assigning a node reference ID to each node, along with its IEEE 1394 Protocol address, i.e., node base address, see col. 3, lines 1-20 & col. 5, lines 3-15, which reads on the claimed 'register for allocating node ID numbers'.

Staats goes on to teach that node reference ID is stored in memory, which reads on the claimed, 'register for storing a record of the node ID numbers allocated to the selected device', see col. 5, lines 5, lines 50-61. In particular, Staats discloses that the node reference ID is stored in a linked list of memory locations. Furthermore Staats teaches that after a bus reset, the node unique ID of any remaining node(s) is compared with those values in the device data records,

such that if any matches are detected then the instant node unique ID is updated to its current node base address. Moreover, the original node reference ID of the device is also re-associated with the node unique ID, based on a pointer, which reads on the claimed feature of, 'and maintaining the record regardless of whether the selected device remains connected to the digital interface', see col. 8, lines 1-60. It is asserted that the node reference ID of Staats corresponds with the claimed unique node identification number.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Yoshino with the feature of maintaining a node reference ID for devices connected to a network, even after a bus reset, for the improvement of allowing bus transactions to be transparent with respect to each device, which Staats discloses is a more efficient manner, col. 1, lines 30-67 thru col. 2, lines 1-25 & col. 9, lines 1-15,since the bus transaction are directed to a node reference ID, (as a destination address) which is a persistent value, instead of the node bus address, which is subject to change at each bus reset.

Considering claims 3 & 13, as for confirming whether a node ID has been allocated, the claimed feature reads on the disclosure of Staats which teaches that upon a bus reset, a bus scan is initiated by the CPU 10, and re-associates node reference IDs stored in memory with their corresponding node unique ID, which are connected to the bus after the reset.

Considering claims 4 & 14, the amended claimed subject matter reads on any or all of the devices being reconnected, after a bus reset and maintaining the same node reference ID, as taught by Staats, col. 7, lines 5-16 & col. 8, lines 11-20.

Considering claims 5 & 15, Yoshino teaches that records stored in the register may be changed by user input, col. 8, lines 10-25, and discusses user selection of a source and/or target device, col. 8, lines 26-55. The claimed feature also reads on the adding or removing a device to/from the bus.

Considering claims 6 & 16, the claimed subject matter reads on the discussion in Staats that the node reference IDs are not discarded upon bus reset, col. 5, lines 4-61.

Considering claims 7 & 17, Yoshino teaches displaying the list of connected devices; see Fig. 5 & Fig. 15; col. 8, lines 10-25 & col. 13, lines 11-30.

Considering claims 8 & 18, see Yoshino, col. 9, lines 5-15; col. 13, lines 11-30; Fig. 8 & Fig. 15, which teaches that disconnected devices have a different appearance from connected devices.

Considering claims 10 & 20, the user in Yoshino is enabled to select a target or source device, col. 13, lines 10-30.

6. Claims 9 & 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoshino & Staats as applied to claims 7 & 17 above, and further in view of Horlander, (U.S. Pat # 6,507,953)

Considering claims 9 & 19, Yoshino, which includes recording devices, does not teach providing a warning when a record of a device to provide recording has been changed. Nevertheless, Horlander, which is in the same field of endeavor provides such a feature, col. 4, lines 12-26; col. 7, lines 66-67 & col. 7- col. 8, line 14. Horlander provides resolution when it detects that a VCR is not on the bus. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to modify Yoshino with the teachings of Horlander, at least for the advantage of notifying the user that a pending recording would not be made, since the recording device is not connected.

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

or faxed to:
(571) 273-8300, (for formal communications intended for entry)
Or:
(571) 273-7290 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reuben M. Brown M. Brown whose telephone number is (571) 272-7290. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F(8:30-6:00), First Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300 for regular communications and After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reuben M. Brown

HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER